



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/555-926	11/23/83	NILSEN	0

OLE K. NILSEN
CAESAR DRIVE, RR-5
BARRINGTON, IL 60010

EXAMINER	
BEHA-W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
212	32

DATE MAILED: 08/20/84

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS, AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS EXTENDED TO RUN 3 MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THE FINAL REJECTION.
855 O.G. 1109.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with Rule 192 (a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed _____, has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under Rule 116(b).
 - ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.
 - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter.
 - ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing of an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be ☒ will not be, entered and the status of the claims in this application would be as follows:
- ☒ Claims 124-128 would be allowable.
 - ☒ Claims 118 & 120-122 would not be allowable.

However:

- ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on references is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
 - ☐ The rejection of claims _____ on non-reference grounds only is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been entered but does not overcome the rejection.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be admitted because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.
6. ☐ The application having been examined under the special accelerated examining procedure (M.P.E.P. 708.02), the proposed amendment has not been considered since it does not prima facie place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

The shortened statutory period for response expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) accompanied by the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee.

Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date that the shortened statutory period for response expires as set forth above.

The amendment filed July 27, 1984 under 37 CFR 1.116 in response to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance and will not be entered because:

The proposed amendment is not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially simplifying the issues for appeal.

The proposed amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.


The new issues are the amendments to claims 118 and 120-122.

The objection to claims 124, 127 and 128 is withdrawn. Claims 124-128 are allowable because they define a relationship between two independent frequency determining elements, namely the series resonant, LC circuit and the saturable core drive circuits and the feedback relationship between the two, resulting in an unexpectedly higher inverter output frequency than the natural resonant frequency of the series LC circuits. This features has not been found in the prior art known to the examiner.

Beha/yp

703-557-5080

8/16/84



WILLIAM H. BEHA, JR.
SENIOR EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 212